

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(a). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115(a).

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JASON EUGENE PERKINS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B295945

Los Angeles County

Super. Ct. No. BA455451

APPEAL from a postjudgment order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Drew E. Edwards, Judge. Affirmed.

Karyn H. Bucur, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Jason Eugene Perkins appeals from the trial court's failure to act on his postjudgment request for judicial administrative records. Our independent review of the record has revealed no arguable appellate issues, and we affirm.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

By information dated May 9, 2017, defendant was charged with one count of residential burglary (Pen. Code,¹ § 459; count 1). The information also alleged defendant had suffered one prior conviction, which constituted both a strike prior (§§ 667, subds. (b)–(j), 1170.12) and a serious-felony prior (§ 667, subd. (a)(1)). Defendant pled not guilty and denied the allegations.

On June 2, 2017, at a hearing at which he represented himself, defendant withdrew his not-guilty plea, pled no contest to count 1, and admitted the prior-conviction allegation. The court sentenced defendant to nine years in prison: four years for count 1—the low term of two years, doubled for the strike prior—plus five years for the serious-felony prior.

On November 13, 2018, defendant filed a request for judicial administrative records. A minute order dated December 20, 2018, states that the court reviewed the court file and took no action on the request.²

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal, and we appointed counsel to represent him. On March 4, 2020, appointed counsel

¹ All undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

² We treat the court's non-action as a denial of the motion.

filed a brief in which counsel raised no issues and asked us to review the record independently under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443. The next day, we notified defendant that his attorney had failed to find any arguable issues and that he could submit by brief or letter any arguments he wished this court to consider. We have not received a response.

DISCUSSION

We have examined the entire record, and are satisfied appellate counsel has fully complied with counsel's responsibilities and no arguable issues exist in the appeal before us. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278–284; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 443.)

DISPOSITION

The postjudgment order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

LAVIN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

EGERTON, J.

DHANIDINA, J.